<div align="center">

REMARKS

</div>

Claims 1-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 13, 15, 17, 27 and 28 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-7 of the Reply. Claim 16 has been canceled.

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of March 4, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   **Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12-24 and 26-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 12-24 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0080855 A1 to Murray. It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Murray does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter relates to a system and method that facilitate viewing and organizing incoming messages based on their respective junk ratings. In particular, independent claim 1 recites a junk message interface system that facilitates identifying junk messages, comprising: *a message receiving component that collects at least one incoming message; a filtering component that determines a junk score for the incoming message, **the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk**; and a display component that renders the junk scores as an actionable property on a user interface to facilitate user management of incoming junk messages*. The cited reference does not expressly or inherently disclose the aforementioned novel aspects of applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in the subject claims.

Murray discloses a method and system that categorize received e-mail messages based on information about the sender. Specifically, a whitelist is created by software running at an e-mail recipient's computer. The whitelist is constructed using e-mail addresses stored by the recipient as well as using the To:, Cc:, and Bcc: information of e-mails sent by the recipient. The subject line of a received message is also checked to see if it matches the subject line of a

<div align="center">

8

</div>

message recently sent by the user. If so, the sender is added to the whitelist. (*See* pg. 1, paragraph [0010]).

In contrast, applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk message interface system, wherein messages are tagged with a junk rating and such rating can be added or saved as a property on the message. The system comprises a message receiving component that accepts incoming messages as they arrive at a user's server or personal computer (PC). The incoming messages can be communicated to a filtering component comprising one or more junk filters. The junk filter can score each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk. The score can be a value between 0 and 1. Once the message has been scored, it can be bucketized into an appropriate junk rating based at least in part on its junk score. (*See* pg. 6, lines 20-27).

Murray merely discloses calculating ratios that a message from a particular sender is spam. The ratios are determined from statistics collected over time and may be converted to a score and applied to the message. (*See* pg. 7, paragraph [0066]). Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk score that is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message. The junk score can be any value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk. Murray merely accumulates statistics for each actual sender and allows a user to set personal delete and spam thresholds.

Accordingly, Murray does not expressly or inherently disclose a system, comprising: ... *a filtering component that determines a junk score for the incoming message, **the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk;*...*.

Further, independent claim 13 recites a user interface that facilitates identifying junk messages comprising: *a junk rating field that can be acted upon by a user, the junk rating being determined at least in part upon by determining a junk score and at least in part upon an analysis of the junk score, **the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of a message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk*.

As stated *supra*, Murray merely discloses calculating ratios that a message from a particular sender is spam. The ratios are determined from statistics collected over time and may

be converted to a score and applied to the message. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk score that is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message. The junk score can be any value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk.

Furthermore, independent claim 15 recites a method that facilitates identification of junk messages in a user's inbox, comprising: *receiving a plurality of incoming messages; assigning a junk rating to the messages; exposing at least the junk rating on a user interface; and* **calculating a junk score for substantially all incoming messages, the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk**.

As stated *supra*, Murray merely discloses calculating ratios that a message from a particular sender is spam. The ratios are determined from statistics collected over time and may be converted to a score and applied to the message. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk filter that scores each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk. The score can be a value between 0 and 1.

Furthermore, independent claim 27 recites a system that facilitates identification of junk messages in a user's inbox, comprising: *means for receiving a plurality of incoming messages;* **means for calculating a junk score for substantially all incoming messages, the junk score is computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, wherein the junk score is a value or fractional value between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk;** *means for assigning a junk rating to the messages commensurate with at least their respective junk scores; and means for exposing at least one of the junk rating and the junk score on a user interface.*

As stated *supra*, Murray merely discloses calculating ratios that a message from a particular sender is spam. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk filter that scores each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk.

Furthermore, independent claim 28 recites a data packet adapted to be transmitted between two or more computer processes facilitating easier viewing and management of incoming messages, the data packet comprising: *information associated with receiving a*

*plurality of incoming messages; **assigning a junk rating to the messages commensurate with at least their respective junk scores, wherein the junk scores are computed to reflect a spam confidence level of the message, and wherein the junk scores are values or fractional values between 0 and 1, and the spam confidence level corresponds to a probability that the message is spam or junk**; and exposing at least one of the junk rating and the junk score on a user interface.*

As stated *supra*, Murray merely discloses calculating ratios that a message from a particular sender is spam and applying the ratio to the message. Applicants' claimed subject matter discloses a junk filter that scores each message based on its spam confidence level, or rather, the likelihood that the message is junk.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that the cited reference fails to expressly or inherently disclose applicants' claimed subject matter as recited in independent claims 1, 13, 15, 27 and 28 (and claims 2, 7-9, 12, 14, 16-24, 26 and 29 which respectively depend there from). Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these claims be deemed allowable.

II.   Rejection of Claim 25 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray. It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Murray does not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. As stated *supra*, Murray does not teach each and every element with respect to independent claim 15 (which claim 25 depends from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claim 25 is not obvious over Murray.

III.   Rejection of Claims 3-6 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3-6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0148330 A1 to Alspector *et al.* It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Murray and Alspector *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Alspector *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Murray with respect to independent claim 1

(which claims 3-6 depend from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 3-6 is not obvious over the combination of Murray and Alspector *et al.*

IV.   Rejection of Claims 10 and 11 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 10 and 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0159136 A1 to Rouse *et al.* It is respectfully requested that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Murray and Rouse *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element as set forth in the subject claims. In particular, Rouse *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Murray with respect to independent claim 1 (which claims 10-11 depend from). Thus, the subject invention as recited in claims 10-11 is not obvious over the combination of Murray and Rouse *et al.*

<div align="center">

CONCLUSION

</div>

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP645US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731